DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 269 292 SO 017 049

AUTHOR Schnell, James
TITLE Communication within the American Counterculture.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 28p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Burnout; *Conflict Resolution; Democratic Values; Group Discussion; *Groups; *Interpersonal Communication; *Morale; Organizational Communication; *Power Structure; Social Theories
IDENTIFIERS *Consensus; Consensus Models; Counter Culture; *Organizational Behavior

ABSTRACT

The nature of communication in the counterculture was investigated. The counterculture is distinguished from subculture and contraculture by its attempts to modify, change, and alter the dominant culture. A food co-op, which presented itself as being based on counterculture philosophy was studied as a representative organization within the counterculture. Field research (participant observation, interviews, and surveys) and a review of the literature were employed to study the conflict resolution attempts within the co-op. Results of the study indicated the co-op conflict resolution communication attempts exemplify dominant culture attempts. The co-op presented itself as using a consensus process (formal situations) and practicing egalitarian ideals (informal situations), but analysis found it did not consistently practice either. (Author/BZ)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED269292

Communication within the American Counterculture

James A. Schnell

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James A. Schnell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SØ017049

Abstract

Communication within the American Counterculture

This study investigates communication in the counterculture. A food co-op, which presents itself as being based on counterculture philosophy, is studied as a representative organization within the counterculture. Field research (participant observation, interviewing, surveys, and review of literature) is employed to study the conflict resolution communication attempts within the co-op. Results of the study indicate the co-op conflict resolution communication attempts exemplify dominant culture attempts. The co-op presents itself as using a consensus process (formal situations) and practicing egalitarian ideals (informal situations), but analysis found it did not practice either.

Communication within the American Counterculture

During the 1960's a youth culture evolved which, among other things, tended to reject primary norms and values of the prevailing culture in favor of a more liberal lifestyle. This culture subsequently became known as the counterculture. Since that time, counterculture has taken on a number of meanings and is represented in various organizational structures.

Two primary explanations of counterculture are provided by Theodore Roszak, in The Making of a Counterculture, and Charles Reich, in The Greening of America. Roszak discusses counterculture as arising from a youthful revulsion at technocracy. It represents a refusal to surrender spontaneity to artificiality. The counterculture serves to reassert life and joy in the face of impersonal organization.[1]

Reich defines counterculture as arising from a perception by the young of contradiction between the stated ideals of the parental generation and their actual lifestyles. He designates six crises within this contradiction: disorder and corruption, decline of democracy, absence of community, poverty (in contrast with affluence), exploitation of technical resources (instead of expanding human resources), and a sense of loss of self.[2]

To better understand counterculture, it is helpful to distinguish between subculture, contraculture, and counterculture. Cohen defines a subculture as "the existence, in effective interaction with one another, of a number of actors with similar problems of adjustment."[3] Within this

situation new group standards are formed among the actors. In "Contraculture and Subculture," Yinger clarifies that subcultures can be recognized without intensive analysis of interaction with the larger culture.[4]

Yinger views contraculture as a subculture that stands in opposition to important aspects of the dominant culture. He suggests the term contraculture:

> wherever the normative system of a group contains, as a primary element, a theme of conflict with the values of the total society, where personality variables are directly involved in the development and maintenance of the group's values, and wherever its norms can be understood only by reference to the relationships of the group to a surrounding dominant culture.[5]

Counterculture is "a term used since the mid-1960's to describe a specific form of youth culture whose members reject key norms and values of the prevailing culture."[6] Counterculture is more readily recognizable, in contrast with subculture and contraculture, through its attempts to modify, change, and alter the dominant culture.

Woodstock is a small city located in the southeastern part of Midwestern State.[7] Aside from being the county seat of Woodstock County, Woodstock is primarily known as the home of Midwestern State University. With 19,000 residents living in Woodstock and a student population of 14,000, the atmosphere is considerably tolerant of countercultural ideals in contrast with other cities and townships in that part of the state.

Within this tolerant atmosphere, a number of countercultural organizations have evolved in Woodstock since the 1960's. One such organization was the Woodstock Food Cooperative (Co-op). The Co-op was initially started as a

buying club which allowed members to order food in bulk once a month. As the buying club became established, it began the transition from a buying club to a Co-op, by renting space above a local restaurant for deliveries and purchases. After experiencing an increased cash flow, the buying club obtained a storefront and was recognized as a Co-op within the Federation of Orange River Co-ops (FORC).

Aside from the Co-op, there were other indicators of the countercultural tolerance in Woodstock during the period of the study. These indicators ranged from a variety of alternative organizations, such as S.A.F.E. (Safe Alternative Forms of Energy), People for Peace, Students for Peace, Woodstock Vietnam Veterans Against the War, and the Gay Rights Coalition, to the prevalent growth of high quality marijuana in the surrounding area.

The Woodstock Food Co-op was reflective of the alternative community which existed in Woodstock (Simpson, Ch. iv; pp. 92-93). The alternative atmosphere was frequently acknowledged in the Woodstock newspapers.

> Woodstock occupies a special place in our hearts because it is a good place to cool out. Here one can live cheaply, ponder life's eternal mysteries and find plenty of people who won't question you about what you intend to do with your life.
>
> It's a good place to hide out. Outside of moving to Bhutan or Tasmania, there's no place one can become invisible faster than here.
>
> It's a good place to weird out. Short of conducting human sacrifices or advocating armed revolution, one will find a high degree of tolerance here. . . . Woodstock is one of the last places where the pleasant, relaxed ethos of the late 1960's still

exists. (Simpson, Ch. iv; pp. 93-94)

Problem

The problem of this study rests on the conflict resolution communication attempts practiced by the Woodstock Food Cooperative. I attempted to find if the primary ideals of the counterculture were evidenced in the communication attempts at conflict resolution. The Co-op presented itself as based on counterculture philosophy. I hypothesized the primary ideals of the counterculture would be evidenced in the communication attempts at conflict resolution.

The Woodstock Food Co-op described itself as a "not-for-profit, good food, member owned and democratically controlled business . . . membership is voluntary and open to all" (Simpson, Ch. i; p. 10). A person could join the Co-op by paying a refundable $20. buying deposit. Members were owners and were encouraged to share in all aspects of the Co-op's operation. General business meetings were held the second Monday of each month.

The Co-op was managed through a committee system. The committees were Cashiers, Communications, Finance, Maintenance, Ordering, Orientation, and Receiving. Extended Membership status was earned by individuals who were active with the Woodstock Birth Center, Woodstock World Hunger Coalition, People for Peace, and The Womens Collective.

Shopping at the Co-op was less formal than shopping at grocery stores. Members brought their own bags and containers for items packed in bulk, such as peanut butter, dried fruits, whole wheat pastas, beans, cooking oils, and liquid soaps.

The underlying philosophy of the Co-op was that cooperation was a

social, economic, and political idea about how people can work together to meet human needs. The introductory "Welcome" newsletter emphasized:

> Being a member means taking responsibility for yourself, and also for the building of a just, peaceful community and world. By operating the Co-op and buying from it, we seek to: 1) become part of an alternative, cooperative, not-for-profit economic system which practices consumer and producer ownership and control, 2) foster an ecologically sound food/production/distribution system, 3) educate consumers about food issues, 4) encourage local self reliance. (Simpson, Ch. i, pp. 12-13)

In a Woodstock newspaper article entitled "Food store 'seed' of new society," Nick Hubbard (cashier) related "It's an opportunity to not just be a food store, but to be part of an ideal to be the seed of a different society" (Simpson, Ch. i; p. 13).

The Co-op had roughly 200 active members during the period of the study. Active members were those who had paid their $20. buying deposit. Approximately 40 of these 200 active members were consistently involved with the decision making processes within the Co-op. Such consistent involvement was generally exercised through employment as a cashier, committee work, or regular attendance at general membership meetings. The store was operated through consensus, whereby all members (present at monthly membership meetings) had to agree with new policies and amendments to the operating rules.[8] The Co-op described itself as an egalitarian organization, whereby all members had equal power.

The FORC organization also operated with consensus decision-making. It was not-for-profit and democratically controlled. FORC, comprised of one

representative per Co-op, met one weekend every two months. Any Co-op member was welcome to attend.

Within its "Bylaws, Structure, and Philosophy" FORC clarified its purpose and intent:

> FORC views itself as a part of a larger social and political movement directed towards creating a society which holds as its first principle the welfare of all human beings. We are a revolutionary organization and, as such, feel solidarity with other people and groups equally committed to providing people with the knowledge and resources necessary to control their own lives. (Simpson, Ch. i; pp. 14-15)

Method

I had two periods of contact with the Woodstock countercultural community. The first was a 17 month period between 1979 and 1981 in which I lived in the community and participated with the Co-op as a member. The second period, between March, 1981 and March, 1982, was spent doing fieldwork research in the Woodstock community and particularly at the Woodstock Food Co-op.

Zelditch classifies field methods into three broad classes which he defines as being primary:

> Type I. Participant Observation. The fieldworker observes and also participates in the same sense that he has durable social relations in the social system. . . .
>
> Type II. Informant Interviewing. We prefer a more restricted

definition of the informant than most fieldworkers use, namely that he be called an "informant" only where he is reporting information presumed to be factually correct about others rather than about himself. . . .

Type III. Enumeration and Samples. This includes surveys and direct, repeated, countable observations.[9]

I gathered data through participant observation, interviews, two surveys, and a review of literature written by/about the Co-op.

Participant observation was the main method used for data gathering. As a member of the Co-op, I had direct access to a variety of organizational situations. Access to the Co-op was exercised in five areas: general business meetings, working at the Co-op, working on three committees, involvement with Co-op related social functions, and informally "hanging out" at the Co-op.

Informative interviews were conducted with members, and former members, of the Co-op. I sought to interview individuals who represented the variety of positions and perspectives maintained by the Co-op membership. Two surveys were used in the gathering of data. I administered a survey which involved processes in formal and informal settings, and the Co-op Orientation Committee (of which I was a member) administered a survey regarding the management of the Co-op. The Co-op printed monthly newsletters, handouts, submitted articles to the FORC newspaper and had articles written about it in the Woodstock area newspapers. I reviewed this literature for information related to the research problem.

Peacock discusses the use of a second observer in field research settings.[10] I utilized the observations of a second observer to compare

and contrast against my own observations (Simpson, Ch. iii; pp. 85-86).

Analysis of conflict resolution communication attempts was divided between formal settings (meetings) and informal settings (outside of meetings). Although the study was concerned primarily with conflict resolution communication attempts, I analyzed the lifestyles and value structures of the Co-op membership to provide additional perspective for the findings (Simpson, Ch. iv; pp. 91-114).

Findings

The data gathered during the period of the study indicated the Co-op conflict resolution communication attempts were based on a counterculture philosophy on the organizational behavior level, but the Co-op conflict resolution communication attempts exemplified dominant culture approaches on the core philosophy level. Organizational behaviors included elements such as rituals, procedures, clothing styles, jargon, and norms.

The Co-op usually used a form of voting within the consensus process framework, instead of using the actual process. That is, if no member opposed a proposal strong enough to major object, then the proposal passed.[11] Power was generally based on who had information and position. If a proposal was objected against at a monthly membership meeting, the major objector and the proposer were supposed to work out an agreement on the objected proposal so it could be put on the agenda of the next monthly membership meeting.

The egalitarian ideals advocated by the Co-op were only superficially evident. Egalitarian ideals were evident on the organizational behavior level, but not on the core philosophy level. Egalitarian ideals were evident

within Co-op rituals, procedures, clothing styles, jargon, and norms, but the egalitarian ideals were not recognized as genuine on the core philosophy level. The Co-op presented itself as egalitarian, but my analysis found consistent behavior contradictory to egalitarian ideals.

Member participation was correlated to power within the Co-op. A basic progression was participation with the organization led to knowledge of the organization, which in turn led to referent power within the organization. A typical example of this progression was evidenced in the cashiers position at the Co-op. As cashiers, they participated considerably in the operation of the Co-op. This participation enhanced their knowledge about the functioning of the organization. As knowledgeable members, they were frequently referred to for advice or direction regarding the needs of the Co-op. Such consistent reference, by the general membership, established the cashiers in positions of power because they, more than most members, knew what was going on.

The degree to which a member could be identified with by other members was correlated with that member's position within the Co-op hierarchy. That is, if Co-op members did not identify with an individual member, this negatively affected that member's position of power and influence.

Burnout generally occurred when members became overinvolved with the Co-op and felt a need to withdrawal from such involvement. Burnout did not represent disagreement or disenchantment with the Co-op; rather, it represented an interest to apply one's time and energy in another area. It was not uncommon for an individual to withdraw from the Co-op and then re-initiate involvement at a later date. Burnout affected the Co-op on three levels: temporary burnout at meetings, burnout experienced by an individual member, and burnout experienced by the entire organization.

Temporary burnout generally occurred near the end of monthly membership meetings. That is, members were tired of sitting and discussing and were anxious to leave. Earl Sebastian described how Rolf Haenisch, the former coordinator of the Co-op, used temporary burnout to his advantage. "He'd wait until the end of meetings, when everybody was burned out, and then propose stuff and give substantiation for the ideas, and folks generally went along with what he did" (Simpson, Ch. iv; p. 100). The coordinator was a temporary position which had been held only by Rolf.

The Co-op did not have an official constitution and bylaws, and subsequently experienced difficulty with recurring problems. A review of meeting minutes and newsletters from the Co-op evidenced problems which were dealt with, but which also managed to recur as problems. The Co-op appeared to "go in circles" with some problems.

Sixty-eight separate issues were analyzed during the period of the study. Typical issues were selected from my fieldnotes to enhance a better understanding of fewer issues, as opposed to a weaker understanding of all the issues. Typical issues were those issues which were representative of behavior and phenomena consistently recognized during the period of the study. Each of the selected typical issues were classified according to the setting they occurred in, formal or informal, and the level of controversy which occurred, high or low level. Thus, there were four quadrants: high level controversy issues in formal settings, high level controversy issues in informal settings, low level controversy issues in formal settings, and low level controversy issues in informal settings.

Formal settings were limited to monthly membership meetings and committee meetings. Informal settings included all situations other than Co-op monthly membership meetings and committee meetings. The distinction between

high level controversy issues and low level controversy issues was more arbitrary. I viewed all issues as being on one continuum, regarding controversy, and worked to recognize them for the degree of controversy they represented within the organization. Thus, issues representing a higher degree of controversy were classified as high level controversy issues and issues representing a lower degree of controversy were classified as low level controversy issues.

Aside from the setting in which issues occurred, distinctions were also recognized according to the types of issues. There were four types of issues: issues of logistics, issues of finance, issues of principle, and issues of personality. Issues of logistics involved the physical maintenance and day-to-day management of the Co-op. Issues of finance involved organizational expenses and the distribution of funds. Issues of principle involved ethical questions and the interpretation of the Co-op's philosophical base. Issues of personality involved the differences between members within the Co-op. The issues of each quadrant were subdivided according to these classifications, regarding issue types.

The following chart outlines the four quadrants of conflict resolution which existed within the Co-op. The types of issues which existed within the quadrants are listed and the number of specific issues, which occurred under each type of issue heading, are indicated.

Examples of typical issues which were selected from my fieldnotes will be described to exemplify previously stated findings. The examples of such issues represent each of the four quadrants.

TABLE 1

FOUR QUADRANTS OF CONFLICT RESOLUTION ATTEMPTS

	Formal Settings	Informal Settings
High Level Controversy	Issues of Logistics: 2 Issues of Finance: 3 Issues of Principle: 7	Issues of Principle: 5 Issues of Personality: 5
Low Level Controversy	Issues of Logistics: 7 Issues of Finance: 13 Issues of Principle: 6	Issues of Logistics: 4 Issues of Finance: 3 Issues of Principle: 10 Issues of Personality: 3

High Level Controversy in Formal Settings

A typical issue in this quadrant involved Operation Wake-up. Operation Wake-up was conceived as a means to perpetuate revenues, community relations, and member involvement. The implementation of Operation Wake-up required the hiring of a coordinator to work on these goals. The membership was cautious in creating such a position because we did not know if we could afford it or if we wanted to get in the habit of paying members, other than cashiers, to do work.

Clark Yost introduced the idea at a store meeting. The store meetings were held a week before the monthly membership meetings; its purpose was to construct an agenda for the monthly membership meeting.

> Clark proposed that the Co-op hire him as a member-coordinator, to work four hours a week to "keep things going." He would be paid the same as cashiers. Drew Salzgaber replied "No, no, no, no, I'll major object to that all the way. . . . That's why I formed Outreach (a committee to gain new members). . . . Clark and Drew stayed after the meeting and worked out their differences on the proposal for two hours. This process involved discussion, compromise, and eventual agreement. They entitled it Operation Wake-up. (Simpson, Ch. iv; p. 223)

An ad appeared in the Woodstock News the following week. "Attention all Woodstock Food Co-op members!! Your presence is needed at January's general meeting. . . . Proposal for Operation Wake-up! (Simpson, Ch. iv; p. 224). Drew paid for the ad with money he borrowed from Clark. I talked with Lois, a cashier, about the ad. As I explained the proposal, she interrupted with "I think Clark just wants a job" (Simpson, Ch. iv; p. 224).

The proposal was formally reviewed at the end of the January, 1982 monthly membership meeting. The meeting was moving into its third hour and Clark suggested we take a five minute break. Ten minutes into Clark's description of the proposal, members started to put their coats on to leave. Randy Horn-Bestel: "I'm leaving in five minutes." Earl Sebastian: "A lot of us have got fires to bank" (woodburning stoves). Clark realized there was not enough time to deal with the proposal and he suggested we form an ad hoc committee to refine the idea (Simpson, Ch. iv; p. 224).

The ad hoc committee, eight members, met ten days later to refine Clark's proposal. The first action was to define our goal as an ad hoc committee. We discussed and decided it dealt with the new job description and the future

direction of the Co-op. Throughout the meeting, Clark Yost promoted ideas that represented structure and Allison Frye promoted ideas representing less structure. Allison: "We need more spirit and less structure." Allison got her way most of the time. The ad hoc committee members tended to identify with Allison, as a person, more than Clark (Simpson, Ch. iv; p. 225).

The Operation Wake-up proposal was on the February, 1982 monthly membership meeting agenda. There was 25 minutes of discussion regarding the direction of the Co-op and hiring a coordinator. Earl Sebastian was a primary supporter of the proposal and he was also informally acting as facilitator.

> Earl: "This will be a historical move. The Co-op seems to have a historical move like this every few years. People are usually scared as hell but we usually end up bettering ourselves, it's how we've progressed. . . . In the past we combined buying clubs into a main Co-op, moved the Co-op to various locations, and eventually got our present store front. This is our next historical step. It's scary and it's exciting." Clark: "Yesterday's visionary will be tomorrow's general manager. Yesterday's movement will be tomorrow's system." Earl then pushed for consensus. "Are there any major objectors?" We did not use the steps of the consensus process at all. No one major objected and the proposal passed. (Simpson, Ch. iv; p. 225)

A hiring committee was formulated and we met a week later to decide upon a hiring procedure. Interested members filled out applications and the applications were reviewed by the committee. Clark Yost was hired as the coordinator of Operation Wake-up. This issue was an issue of finance.

Low Level Controversy in Formal Settings

Typical issues in this quadrant included extending the Saturday hours of operation and being open on Sundays.

Janet Krebs proposed, at the October, 1981 monthly membership meeting, that the Co-op extend Saturday store hours from 5 p.m. to 7 p.m. Store hours had been 11 a.m. to 5 p.m. There was a five minute discussion among the cashiers regarding how busy the Co-op was on Saturdays. The rest of the membership listened to the discussion, but provided no input. A friendly amendment was submitted by the cashiers which suggested the Co-op be open from 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. on Saturdays. There were no objections. The amended proposal passed (Simpson, Ch. iv; p. 231).

A suggestion that the Co-op be open on Sunday was listed as a discussion topic at the same meeting. The cashiers believed that Sunday would not be a very busy day and the best approach might be to use volunteer cashiers. That is, do not pay the members who volunteer as cashiers on Sundays. The cashiers said they would take an informal poll of members to see if there was interest in the idea (Simpson, Ch. iv; p. 232).

Tom Kocher attended the November, 1981 store meeting and suggested we discuss being open on Sunday at the monthly membership meeting. Tom: "When we first got started, Sunday was the only day we were open" (Simpson, Ch. iv; p. 232). We put it on the agenda, but the monthly membership meeting lasted too long and we did not have time to discuss the idea.

Tom Kocher re-submitted the proposal at the February, 1982 store meeting. He led the discussion of the proposal at the following monthly membership meeting. He suggested we be open four hours on Sunday and use volunteer cashiers. Janet Krebs (a cashier) questioned the capability of

volunteer cashiers. Janet: "This is a real business, we can't open the doors with anybody behind the counter representing us." Suggestions were made during the discussion and the membership decided the proposal should be modified and presented at the next meeting. The suggestions dealt with who should work and when they would work (Simpson, Ch. iv; p. 232). The proposal was never brought up again and Tom Kocher did not attend any more Co-op meetings during the period of the study. These issues were issues of logistics.

High Level Controversy in Informal Settings

Typical issues in this quadrant included expressed differences between Drew Salzgaber and Clark Yost; Drew Salzgaber and Nick Hubbard; and Drew Salzgaber and Adam Young.

The following fieldnote excerpts outline Clark's negative feelings about Drew.

> Met Karla Donaho in Lowell Center (university student center) to watch the evening news on television before going to the monthly membership meeting. Karla: "Clark is gonna tell Drew he doesn't wanna talk with him about the Co-op after the meetings are over from now on." (Simpson, Ch. iv; p. 242)
>
> (After a store meeting a group of members were going drinking at the Shack.) Clark to Drew: "I'm personally inviting you not to come with us to drink beer tonight . . . 'cos I wanna talk with these folks without you." (Simpson, Ch. iv; p. 242)
>
> Clark approached Karla and I to talk about Drew. He and others

> want to initiate action to terminate Drew's membership. . . . Clark: "Drew has been perpetuating a lot of negative energy and bad consciousness for a long, long time." (Simpson, Ch. iv; p. 242).

Clark was generally concerned with Drew's irresponsibility as a member of the Co-op and how this affected the image of the Co-op.

Nick Hubbard (head cashier) seemed to represent the general views of the Co-op membership in his differences with Drew. That is, Nick's concerns with Drew usually involved Drew's violation of Co-op rules or instances when Drew's behavior was detrimental to Co-op discussions. His statements to Drew reflected appeals that Drew modify his behavior in the best interest of the Co-op. The following fieldnote excerpts exemplify typical statements by Nick to Drew.

> Before the meeting started, Nick pulled Drew aside. Nick: "Come here Drew, I wanna talk with you a minute. This is a personal comment, not an official comment. You've got to quit talking so long during meetings and wasting so much time with stuff that isn't pertinent." (Simpson, Ch. iv; p. 243)
>
> (At the Co-op.) Nick: "Get off the phone Drew!!! Go use the payphone!" Drew: "I haven't got a dime." Nick: "Go to Lowell Center (to use their phones)." Drew: "I'll get arrested; I'm banned from there because of some fucked up thing." Nick: "Well, you know the rules." Drew was not allowed to use the Co-op phone due to his previous unpaid long distance calls. (Simpson, Ch. iv; p. 243)
>
> Drew came into the Co-op to use the phone. Nick was visibly upset. Nick: "No! You can't use the phone!" Drew: "Just one more time

> for an emergency." Nick: "Ya know Drew, there's a lot of people who wanna kick you out of the Co-op." Drew: "But I haven't done anything wrong." Nick: "The uneasy sentiment should serve as an indicator." (Simpson, Ch. iv; p. 243)
>
> Clark and Drew were discussing Operation Wake-up at the Co-op and Drew seemed to disagree with everything Clark said. Nick yelled from behind the cash register: "You're a talker Drew, but you don't do a damn thing. You're a philosopher with no follow through. . . . If I had my way, well, never mind." Nick walked over to the booth where Clark and Drew were sitting. Nick: "You don't do a damn thing. All you do is talk." (Simpson, Ch. iv; p. 244)

Nick Hubbard and Clark Yost exercised considerable tolerance with Drew, but they did vent their frustrations periodically.

The following situation occurred when I was administering the Co-op survey at the Co-op. Ironically, it was during that period I observed an atypical physical threat at the Co-op.

> Drew wrote a $90. check to a friend of Adam Young's for a chainsaw. Adam's friend "really needed the money" and the check bounced. Adam approached Drew about the bounced check and Drew claimed it was a mistake. Adam told Drew he was gonna go with him to Adam's friend's house to straighten things out. Adam went to call his friend and told Drew "if you try to run out of here, I'll beat the shit out of you. I'm basically a nonviolent person but you fucked over a friend of mine." (Simpson, Ch. iv; p. 244)

Drew is mentioned many times in my fieldnotes. He is referenced in 59

separate instances. Oddly enough, a majority of the membership had differences with Drew, but he rarely had differences with them. That is, I never observed a situation where Drew was criticizing another member, although he did criticize ideas. Rather, he was always in a defensive position being criticized by other members. These issues were issues involving differences of personality.

Low Level Controversy in Informal Settings

A typical issue in this quadrant involved moving a cooling unit. I first learned of the issue involving the cooler while working with the maintenance committee. We were painting the Co-op floor on a Sunday when the Co-op was closed. I noticed a produce cooler which had never been used at the Co-op and asked Randy Horn-Bestel, the maintenance committee chairperson, about it.

> Randy told how the cooler, Nick Hubbard's idea, was bought and moved against the west wall. Since it was then located under the heater, they decided to move it over to the east wall. After they moved it to the east wall, they found out the cooler should be by a window and would have to be moved back to the west wall. Since Randy helped move the cooler before, he won't help move it back to the west wall. Randy: "Somebody should get their act together with it." (Simpson, Ch. iv; p. 245)

Drew was talking with some other members, a month later, about grandiose plans for expanding the Co-op and there was a discussion about the Co-op's potential. Nick commented "Hell, we can't even get the cooler moved to the

other side of the Co-op and we're talking about this other stuff" (Simpson, Ch. iv; p. 246). The cooler was never moved or used during the entire period of the study. This issue was an issue of logistics.

Conclusions

The Co-op conflict resolution communication attempts exemplified dominant culture attempts on the core philosophy level. The Co-op used voting within a consensus process framework in formal settings and a hierarchy was evident in informal settings. The Co-op conflict resolution communication attempts exemplified counterculture attempts on the organizational behavior level. Organizational behaviors included ritual, procedures, clothing styles, jargon, and norms. The Co-op presented itself, through organizational behaviors, as using the consensus process in formal settings, but analysis found it did not use the consensus process. The entire process was never used during the period of the study. The Co-op presented itself, through organizational behaviors, as an egalitarian organization in informal settings, but analysis found it did not practice egalitarian ideals.

These findings carry implications with the Dramaturgical school of symbolic interaction. That is, social interaction is based on the management of impressions we receive from each other. Erving Goffman developes this notion in The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life.

> I have said that when an individual appears before others his actions will influence the definition of the situation which they have come to have.[12]
>
> When an individual appears before others he will have many motives for trying to control the impression they receive of the situation.[13]

> In consequence, when an individual projects a definition of the situation and thereby makes an implicit or explicit claim to be a person of a particular kind he automatically exerts a moral demand upon the others, obliging them to value and treat him in the manner that persons of his kind have a right to expect.[14]

The importance of the conflict resolution communication attempts is that the attempts constructed a presentation made by the organization members.

The Co-op presented itself as using the consensus process, which exemplifies counterculture ideals, but analysis found it did not use the consensus process. The Co-op presented itself as egalitarian, which exemplifies counterculture ideals, but analysis found it did not practice egalitarian approaches. Thus, the Co-op presented itself as countercultural through its conflict resolution communication attempts, and such attempts were often perceived as countercultural, but my analysis found the presentation of countercultural conflict resolution communication attempts to be superficial. That is, the countercultural ideals were only superficially evident through organizational behaviors.

The Co-op usually used voting within a consensus process framework in formal settings. The informal hierarchy was based on power by identification and participation. Participation within the organization led to knowledge about the functioning of the organization, which in turn led to referent power within the organization.

There was a considerable ideological and logistical distance between counterculture organizations and dominant culture organizations in the United States during the late 1960's and early 1970's. The past decade has seen this distance become smaller with the formation of a common ground between

counterculture organizations and dominant culture organizations. An example of this common ground was recognized, during the period of the study, when FORC adopted a Board of Directors and large supermarket chains gave increased emphasis to the marketing of health foods. That is, a Board of Directors approach was previously considered to be unacceptable in the counterculture and the health food market was not previously emphasized by the large, dominant culture, supermarket chains.

I believe the counterculture offers a needed alternative for those who reject the dominant culture. If the Co-op is representative of most countercultural organizations, countercultural ideals will only be superficially evident within most countercultural organizations. Could similar dichotomies exist within other types of dominant culture organizations? An example of such a dichotomy might be recognized between the U.S. Air Force Strategic Air Command's motto ("Peace is our Profession") and it's actual mission. I believe it would be beneficial to observe positons presented by various types of organizations, through their organizationsl behaviors, and compare the professed positions against their actual practices. This analysis is intended as a contribution towards such study.

Notes

[1] Theodore Roszak, The Making of a Counterculture (Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1969), Ch. 2.

[2] Charles Reich, The Greening of America (New York: Random House, Inc., 1972), Ch. 1.

[3] Albert Cohen, Delinquent Boys (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1955), p. 59.

[4] J. Milton Yinger, "Contraculture and Subculture," American Sociological Review, No. 25 (1960), pp. 628-629.

[5] Yinger, p. 269.

[6] "Counterculture," Encyclopedia of Sociology (Guilford, Conn.: Dushkin Publishing Group, Inc., 1974), p. 60.

[7] Woodstock is a fictitious name. Pseudonyms have been used in the place of real names of individuals and organizations analyzed in this study. Descriptions of the city, organizations, and lifestyles are presented in Robert Jay Simpson, "An Ethnographic Study: Comparison of Conflict Resolution Communication in the Woodstock Food Cooperative and Sigma Tau Omega Fraternity," Diss. _____ University 1982, pp. 91-114. All further references to this work appear in the text.

[8] The consensus process was the decision-making and conflict resolution method used by the Co-op at monthly membership meetings. The primary appeal of consensus process was that it promoted cooperation instead of competition. It is a 16 step process which emphasizes discussion and compromise.

Consensus process is further described in Simpson, Ch. iv; pp. 173-185.

[9] Morris Zelditch, "Some Methodological Problems of Field Studies," in Qualitative Methodology, ed. William Filstead (Chicago: Markham Publishing Co., 1970), p. 220.

[10] James Peacock, Rites of Modernization (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968), p. 270.

[11] A major objection is an irreconcilable objection to a proposal. It stops current action on the proposal and the major objector accepts responsibility for meeting with the proposer to rewrite the proposal. Major objection is further described in Simpson, Ch. iv; pp. 173-185.

[12] Erving Goffman, The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life (Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1959), p. 6.

[13] Goffman, p. 15.

[14] Goffman, p. 13.

Bibliography

Cohen, Albert. Delinquent Boys. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1955.

"Counterculture." Encyclopedia of Sociology. Guilford, Conn.: Dushkin Publishing Group, Inc., 1974.

Goffman, Erving. The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1959.

Peacock, James. Rites of Modernization. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Reich, Charles. The Greening of America. New York: Random House, Inc., 1972.

Roszak, Theodore. The Making of a Counterculture. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1969.

Simpson, Robert Jay. "An Ethnographic Study: Comparison of Conflict Resolution Communication in the Woodstock Food Cooperative and Sigma Tau Omega Fraternity." Diss. _____ University 1982.

Yinger, J. Milton. "Contraculture and Subculture," American Sociological Review, No. 25 (1960), 625-635.

Zelditch, Morris. "Some Methodological Problems of Field Studies." In Qualitative Methodology. Ed. William Filstead. Chicago: Markham Publishing Co., 1970, pp. 217-231.